

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,761	STEWART, CHARLES R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suzanne M. Noakes, Ph.D.	1653	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Suzanne M. Noakes, Ph.D. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Dr. Michael Berger. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 06 March 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 17 was agreed to be withdrawn from further consideration. The claim is inconsistent with the elected subject matter as it is drawn to a method of inhibiting bacteria by administering a bacetriophage vector rather than a protein. Since the claim had been previously examined on the merits in the Office action of September 19, 2005 one of two options were present, either a written restriction requirement sent by the examiner or an oral agreement to withdraw the claim from further consideration. Dr. Berger agreed to the later in an effort to expedite prosecution.